

Application No.: 10/788,756

REMARKS

Thorough examination and careful review of the application by the Examiner is noted and appreciated.

The indication by the Examiner that Claims 12 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims is further acknowledged and appreciated.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Claims 17-20 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner.

Claims 1-11 and 13-15 are rejected.

Claims 12 and 16 are objected to.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Tomaru et al '327.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to further recite the limitations contained in Claim 2, "a support body comprises a silicon wafer". The newly amended independent Claim 1 is therefore not anticipated by Tomaru et al. Claims 3, 5, and 7 depend on the newly amended independent Claim 1, and therefore are likewise allowable. A reconsideration for allowance of these claims is respectfully requested of the Examiner.

Claim 9 has been amended to further recite the limitations contained in Claims 11 and 12, which the Examiner has indicated would be allowable. The newly amended independent

Application No.: 10/788,756

Claim 9 is therefore equivalent to Claim 12 being rewritten into independent form to include all of the limitations contained in base Claim 9 and in intervening Claim 11. A reconsideration for allowance of Claim 9 is respectfully requested of the Examiner. Claims 11 and 15 have been cancelled for duplicating independent Claim 9. Claim 13 depends on the newly amended independent Claim 9, and therefore is likewise allowable. A reconsideration for allowance of Claim 13 is respectfully requested of the Examiner.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Horton et al '916. It is contended that Horton et al teaches an inert wafer comprising a tetrafluoroethylene resin sized to be identical to a blank silicon wafer that may contain a metal plate such that it will be identically sized and weighted as a production silicon wafer.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to further recite the limitations contained in Claim 2. The newly amended independent Claim 1 is therefore not anticipated by Horton et al under 35 USC § 102(b). A reconsideration for allowance is respectfully requested of the Examiner.

Claim 3 depends on the newly amended independent Claim 1, and therefore is likewise allowable. A reconsideration for allowance of Claim 3 is respectfully requested of the Examiner.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lin '773. It is contended that Lin teaches a silicon wafer that has deposited thereon elastomer layers and therefore the silicon wafer reads on the support body of the instant claims.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to further recite the limitations contained in

Application No.: 10/788,756

Claim 2, which is cancelled as a result.

Lin '773 discloses a strain release contact system for integrated circuit to solve the problem of stress transmission from the outside of an IC package into the interior of the semiconductor. The Lin method places a micro-spring between the external solder ball and the interior tab. The elastomer layer 42 (Figure 4) is placed on the silicon wafer 1 for a completely different purpose and serves a completely different function, i.e. the metal posts 21 are encapsulated in the elastomer layer 42 for stress relief. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the elastomer layer 42 is not the present invention "particle-adherent layer that has a particle-adherent surface".

The rejection of Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, and 13 under 35 USC §102(b) based on Lin is therefore respectfully traversed. A reconsideration for allowance of these claims is respectfully requested of the Examiner.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claims 2 and 4-8 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Horten et al. It is contended that Horten et al teaches all of the limitations of Claims 2 and 4-8, except for the use of a silicon wafer as the plate and the presence of an adhesive layer between the tetrafluoroethylene resin layer and the plate.

Claim 2 has been cancelled and withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner.

The rejection of Claims 4-8 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Horten et

Application No.: 10/788,756

al is respectfully traversed.

Claims 4-8 depend on the newly amended independent Claim 1 which clearly recites, "a support body comprises a silicon wafer" and a "particle-adherent layer having a particle-adherent surface carried by said support body."

The Applicants agree with the Examiner that Horton does not teach the use of a silicon wafer as the plate, and furthermore, Horton does not teach the presence of an adhesive layer between the tetrafluoroethylene resin layer and the plate, the Applicants further submit that it is only the present invention that recognizes the solution to the problem normally associated with using silicon wafer as the plate, i.e. the brittle nature of the wafer, by coating the wafer with a resilient and flexible tetrafluoroethylene resin layer. Furthermore, it is only the present invention that recognizes that in order to coat the silicon wafer with a tetrafluoroethylene layer, an adhesive layer must be used therein between. None of these criticalities is recognized by Horton et al, let alone a solution to the problem proposed by Horton et al. The only disclosure by Horton et al is to use tetrafluoroethylene plate and adding metal particles or metal plates to the layer in order to increase the weight of the plate. The Horton et al reference therefore completely lacks the teaching of the present invention, as now narrowly recited in the newly amended independent Claim 1, onto which Claims 4-8 depend. A reconsideration for allowance of Claims 4-8 under 35 USC §103(a) is therefore respectfully requested of the Examiner.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending Claims, i.e. Claims 1, 3-9, and 13 are now in condition for allowance. Such favorable action by the Examiner at any early date is respectfully solicited.

Application No.: 10/788,756

In the event that the present invention as claimed is not in condition for allowance for any reason, the Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicants' representative at his Bloomfield Hills, Michigan office at (248) 540-4040 such that necessary action may be taken to place the application in a condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

TUNG & ASSOCIATES

Randy W. Tung
Reg. No. 31,311

TUNG & ASSOCIATES
838 W. Long Lake Road, Suite 120
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302
Tel: (248) 540-4040
Fax: (248) 540-4035